## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/587,496	TANIGUCHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

		Jeffrey C. Mullis	1796			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress		
THE	THE REPLY FILED <u>04 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of Areplies: (1) an amendment, affidavioal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) b)	The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.		
have unde set fo may i	nsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended from: (1) the expiration date of the sorth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). TICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
2. 🗀	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause		
o. <u>C</u>	(a) $\boxtimes$ They raise new issues that would require further cor			oause		
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		. —,,			
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for		
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11)		ected claims.			
4. 🛚	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	mpliant Amendment ( <b>I</b>	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. <u> </u>	non-allowable claim(s).	·	-	_		
7. 🔀	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1,4,5,7,8 and 10-17.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☑ will not be entered, or b) □ wil ided below or appended.	l be entered and an ex	planation of		
AFFI	IDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a		
	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation ■UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.		
	▼ The request for reconsideration has been considered but see attachment.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (  ✓ Other: <u>PTO-892</u> .	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
		/ loffroy C. Mullio/				
		/Jeffrey C. Mullis/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1796			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants amendment to the last two lines of claim 1 is not in accordance with Rule 121 in that words being deleted are not shown with strike through and words added are not underlined. Furthermore, the limitation "crosslinked" was not previously present and would require further consideration and search. Also the specification as filed does not disclose crosslinking of functional groups but rather only discloses crosslinking of polymers and this limitation is therefore new matter. Lastly the term "crosslinking" as used in the art generally refers to polymers not moieties thereon as applicants have attempted to amend the claims and applicants' amendment would therefore render the claims unclear.